REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 8, 13, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher (U.S. Pat. No. 5,930,468) in view of Loffler (U.S. Pat. No. 5,010,820). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and further in view of Rai (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0149747). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and further in view of Yacoub (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0011085). Claims 5, 6, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and further in view of Bauer (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0039461). Claims 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and Bauer and further in view of Noyes (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0011792). Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler, Bauer and Noyes and further in view of Wasenius (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0151320). Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and further in view of Pfeiffer (U.S. 5,447,102). Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher in view of Loffler, Bauer and Jackson et al. (U.S. 7,604,848).

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Support is found at paragraph [0006], for example.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application based on the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 8, 13, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher in view of Loffler.

Zingher is discussed in detail in paragraph [0004] of the specification.

Loffler discloses a process for the defined production of an ink distribution appropriate to a production run in the inking unit of rotary printing presses. "To create an ink distribution in the inking unit appropriate to the print run during the conversion of the inking unit from a previous job to a subsequent and new print job, the invention provides an improved method for the removal of the current ink profile so that the new ink profile can be established for the

subsequent print job in a short time, without the necessity of emptying, cleaning and washing the inking unit." (Abstract).

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for determining an optimum procedure for a job change between a first machine job and a subsequent machine job on a printing-material processing machine having at least one control computer, the method comprising:

comparing first data of the first machine job to second data of the subsequent machine job using the at least one control computer, and

establishing an order of adjustments and maintenance operations to be carried out during the job change between the first machine job and the subsequent machine job as a function of the comparing step.

Neither Zingher nor Loffler discloses "establishing an order of adjustments and maintenance operations to be carried out during the job change between the first machine job and the subsequent machine job as a function of the comparing step" as now recited in claim 1. Zingher discloses sorting an order that print jobs are carried out based on individual image contents of the jobs (See col. 3; lines 8 to 10 and col. 7; lines 18 to 33), which is in no way "establishing an order of adjustments and maintenance operations to be carried out during the job change between the first machine job and the subsequent machine job as a function of the comparing step," as now recited in claim 1. Also, Loffler does not cure this deficiency of Zingher as Loffler merely teaches optimizing inking settings for a subsequent print job and teaches a sequential order for optimizing the inking settings. Loffler in no way indicates that the order of operations carried out when changing from a previous ink profile to the subsequent ink profile is a function of the comparing step. In Loffler, even if parameters of the subsequent ink profile are changed, the sequence of setting up the ink profile is always the same, regardless of any relationship between the previous print job and the subsequent print job. Loffler, at column 2, line 35 to column 4, line 58, merely lists different embodiments of the invention in Loffler, each embodiment including an order of steps that is performed independent of any comparison between the previous print job and the subsequent print job.

It is also respectfully submitted that it would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art to have modified the method of Zingher in view of the method of Loffler to meet the

limitations of claim 1. Neither reference indicates that it would be desirable to establish an order of adjustments and maintenance operations for a print job change as a function of first and second data. It is respectfully submitted that if the method of Zingher was for some reason modified in view of Loffler, the resulting method would involve changing the order print jobs are carried out and establishing a new ink profile before the subsequent print job is started, by setting the inking profile of the subsequent print job based on the set sequential order of steps discloses in Loffler. Thus, any combination of Zingher and Loffler would not meet the requirements of claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 1, and claims 2, 17 and 18 depending therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 recites a device for determining an optimum procedure for a job change on a printing-material processing machine comprising:

at least one control computer comparing first data of a first machine job to second data of a subsequent machine job, and executing program steps as a function of the comparing step to establish an order of operations to be carried out during the job change.

Zingher does not disclose "executing program steps as a function of the comparing step to establish an order of operations to be carried out during the job change" as recited in claim 8. As stated above, it is respectfully submitted that both Zingher and Loffler fail to show establishing an order of operation between print jobs as a function of a comparison of data of the print jobs as required by claim 8 and it would not have been obvious to have combined the references to meet the limitations of claim 8.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

Claim 13, as amended, recites a printing press comprising:

a device for determining an optimum procedure for a job change between a first machine job and a subsequent machine job on a printing-material processing machine, the device including at least one control computer comparing first data of the first machine job to second data of the subsequent machine job, and executing program steps as a function of the comparing step to establish an order of adjustments and maintenance operations to be carried out during the

job between the first machine job and the subsequent machine job.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Zingher nor Loffler shows "executing program steps as a function of the comparing step to establish an order of adjustments and maintenance operations to be carried out during the job between the first machine job and the subsequent machine job" as now recited in claim 13. As stated above, both Zingher and Loffler fail to show establishing an order of adjustments and maintenance operation between print jobs as a function of a comparison of data of the print jobs as required by claim 13 and it would not have been obvious to have combined the references to meet the limitations of claim 13.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 13 is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and further in view of Rai (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0149747).

Zingher and Loffler are discussed above.

Rai discloses a centralized server for providing analytic services to print shops which are located remotely from the centralized server. (See paragraph [0013]).

Claim 3 recites "wherein a number of operating personnel of the printing-material processing machine is taken into account in the determination of the optimum procedure."

One of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified Zingher in view of Rai because Zingher emphasizes using a data processing device to optimize in terms of time, process and/or in terms of economy of materials for pixel-by-pixel comparison and to determine the method with which the individual print jobs are carried out. (See col. 5; lines 12 to 21 and col. 4; lines 55 to col. 5 lines 6).

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and further in view of Yacoub (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0011085).

Zingher and Loffler are discussed above.

Yacoub discloses a networked printing solution which minimizes the necessity of user interaction in the printing process. (See paragraph [0008]).

Claim 4 recites "wherein a length of paths to be traveled by operating personnel of the printing-material processing machine while carrying out the order of processes is taken into account in the determination of the optimum procedure."

It would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Zingher in view of Yacoub to meet the claimed limitation because Yacoub does not disclose anything about an order of processes in carried out by operating personnel as recited in claim 4. Yacoub discloses printing solutions for an end user which is not an order of processes of a printing-material processing machine being carried out by operating personnel.

Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and further in view of Bauer (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0039461).

Zingher and Loffler are discussed above.

Bauer discloses an apparatus and method for planning and controlling production sequences which permits flexible scheduling and coordination of the print jobs. (See paragraph [0011]).

Bauer is cited for allegedly disclosing the additional limitations of claims 5, 6, 9 and 12 not present in claims 1 and 8 and does not cure the deficiencies of Zingher and Loffler with respect to claim 1, upon which claims 5 and 6 depend, and claim 8, upon which claims 9 and 12 depend. In view of the above arguments with respect to claim 1 and claim 8, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 5, 6, 9 and 12 is respectfully requested.

With further respect to claim 5, neither Zingher, Loffler nor Bauer discloses "the method as recited in claim 1 further comprising visually displaying the established order of processes to operating personnel" as recited in claim 5. Bauer discloses using the planning board to make changes to the display elements to permit scheduling and coordination of the production sequences which is not the "displaying the established order of processes" required by claim 5. (See Bauer paragraph [0013], [0020] and [0031] to [0032]).

With further respect to claim 6, neither Zingher nor Bauer discloses "wherein the

operating personnel are guided through individual steps of a calculated order of processes via one or more display devices mounted on the printing-material processing machine" as recited in claim 6. Bauer shows that the display on the planning board can be changed therefore, it is not a "calculated order of processes" as in the present invention. (See Bauer paragraph [0013], [0020] and [0031] to [0032]).

Claims 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and Bauer and further in view of Noyes (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0011792).

Bauer and Noyes are cited for allegedly disclosing the additional limitations of claims 7 and 10 not present in claims 1 and 8 and do not cure the deficiencies of Zingher and Loffler with respect to claim 1, upon which claim 7 depends, and claim 8, upon which claim 10 depends. In view of the above arguments with respect to claim 1 and claim 8, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 7 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler, Bauer and Noyes and further in view of Wasenius (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0151320).

Bauer, Noyes and Wasenius are cited for allegedly meeting the additional limitations of claim 11 not present in claim 8 and do not cure the deficiencies of Zingher and Loffler with respect to claim 8, upon which claim 11 depends. In view of the above arguments with respect to claim 1 and claim 8, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 7 and 10 is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher as modified by Loffler and further in view of Pfeiffer (U.S. 5,447,102).

Pfeiffer is cited for allegedly disclosing the additional limitations of claims 14 and 15 not present in claim 13 and does not cure the deficiencies of Zingher and Loffler with respect to claim 13, upon which claims 14 and 15 depend. In view of the above arguments with respect to claim 13, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 14 and 15 is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zingher in view of Loffler, Bauer and Jackson et al. (U.S. 7,604,848).

Bauer and Jackson et al. are cited for allegedly meeting the additional limitations of claim 16 not present in claim 1 and do not cure the deficiencies of Zingher and Loffler with respect to claim 1, upon which claim 16 depends. In view of the above arguments with respect to claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claim 16 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: _____

William C. Gehris
(Reg. No. 38,156)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940